

# INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION SUPPLEMENTAL EDUCATIONAL SERVICES

## 2007-2008 COMPLIANCE AND ON-SITE MONITORING REPORT FOR:

### Standards for Excellence

DOCUMENT ANALYSIS		OBSERVATION		COMPLIANCE	
<b>Tutor Qualifications</b>	<i>Unsatisfactory</i>	<b>Lesson matches original description</b>	2 <i>Approaching Standards</i>	<b>Criminal Background Checks</b>	<i>Non compliance</i>
<b>Recruiting Materials</b>	<i>Unsatisfactory</i>	<b>Instruction is clear</b>	2 <i>Approaching Standards</i>	<b>Health/safety laws &amp; regulations</b>	<i>In Compliance</i>
<b>Academic Program</b>	<i>Unsatisfactory</i>	<b>Time on task is appropriate</b>	2 <i>Approaching Standards</i>	<b>Financial viability</b>	<i>In Compliance</i>
<b>Progress Reporting</b>	<i>Unsatisfactory</i>	<b>Instructor is appropriately knowledgeable</b>	2 <i>Approaching Standards</i>		
<b>Assessment and Individual Program Design</b>	<i>Unsatisfactory</i>	<b>Student/instructor ratio: 4:1</b>	3 <i>Meets Standards</i>		

**Standards for Excellence is placed on probation for the 2008-2009 school year due to concerns regarding the onsite monitoring visit and submitted documentation as detailed in the enclosed monitoring report. As such, Standards for Excellence has been required to implement corrective actions to address all areas of concern.**

## On-site Monitoring Visit Rubric DOCUMENT ANALYSIS Components

**NAME OF PROVIDER:** Standards for Excellence  
**REVIEWER:** S.T.

**DATE DOCUMENTATION RECEIVED:** March 5, 2008

Providers are required to submit documentation for each component during the site visit. If documentation is not available on-site, the director or head of the provider's organization, the site director, or another authorized representative will be required to submit documentation to the IDOE within seven (7) calendar days of site visit completion. **Failure to submit evidence could result in removal from the approved provider list.** Providers will be given an Unsatisfactory or Satisfactory for each component. Providers receiving an Unsatisfactory for any component may be required to address deficiencies within 7 calendar days of receiving their final report.

COMPONENT	DOCUMENTATION NEEDED	DOCUMENTATION SUBMITTED (IDOE use only)	UNSATISFACTORY	SATISFACTORY	COMMENTS
Tutor qualifications	<b>BOTH</b> of the following: -Tutor resumes/applications ( <u>all tutors</u> ) -Documentation of professional development opportunities in which tutors have participated (i.e. sign-sheets, agendas, presentations, certificates of completion, etc.) <b>In addition to:</b> <b>ONE</b> of the following: -Tutor evaluations ( <u>all tutors</u> ) -Recruiting policy for tutors ( <u>one copy</u> ) -Sample tutor contract ( <u>one copy</u> )	-Resumes and applications -Tutor contract -PowerPoint Presentations and training materials	<b>X</b>		-Tutor contract is in line with provider's application; -One tutor does not meet provider's or IDOE's minimum tutor qualifications; -Although some training materials (i.e. PowerPoints, training packets, etc.) were submitted, provider was not able to verify tutors attended the trainings described in provider's application.
Recruiting materials	<b>TWO</b> of the following:        -Advertising or recruitment fliers -Incentives policy -Program description for parents	-Recruitment flyer -Program description for parents	<b>X</b>		-For the most part, the recruitment flyer is in line with provider's application, however, while the flyer describes "customized tutoring", students were observed working on the same lessons with their tutor. No student was observed receiving individualized or adjusted instruction based upon individual student needs and the tutor shared he/she did not have an individual learning plan for each student;  -In addition, the program description states that tutors are recruited from universities or are certified teachers, however, based upon a review of tutor resumes and applications this is not an accurate statement. For instance, out of the 26 applications/resumes received, it appears that only a few tutors were recruited from local universities and only approximately 5 tutors are certified teachers.

COMPONENT	DOCUMENTATION NEEDED	DOCUMENTATION SUBMITTED (IDOE use only)	UNSATISFACTORY	SATISFACTORY	COMMENTS
Academic Program	<p><b>ONE</b> of the following:</p> <p>-Lesson plan(s) for the observed tutoring session(s) and for each subject in which provider tutors</p> <p><i>In addition to:</i></p> <p><b>ONE</b> of the following:</p> <p>-Specific connections to Indiana standards (cite exact IN standard to which lesson connects)</p> <p>-Description of connections to curriculum of EACH district the provider works with.</p>	<p>-Lesson plans</p> <p>-Connection to Indiana academic standards</p>	<b>X</b>		<p>-Lesson plans are appropriate and include important details necessary for effective instruction such as a review of previous concepts, materials to be used, lesson objectives, and tips on guided practice for students;</p> <p>-Submitted lessons connect to Indiana academic standards;</p> <p>-However, the lessons submitted are not in line with lessons observed during the tutoring session. Not only did the tutor not use a lesson plan for the observed session, but, the tutor did not have lesson plans for any of the previous sessions. In addition, students were not observed using any of the lesson materials described in provider's application (i.e. Spotlight on Math, Math Around the Clock curriculum or the Prentice Hall lesson materials);</p> <p>-Although the submitted lessons for math were from the Prentice Hall curriculum as described in the application, the lesson plans for reading were from Pearson Education when the application states Open Court reading materials and Scott Foresman materials would be used.</p>

COMPONENT	DOCUMENTATION NEEDED	DOCUMENTATION SUBMITTED (IDOE use only)	UNSATISFACTORY	SATISFACTORY	COMMENTS
Progress Reporting	<p><b>ALL</b> of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Progress reports (see IDOE e-mail for details regarding the request for progress reports)</li> <li>-Timeline for sending progress reports</li> <li>-Documentation of reports sent</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-SES Contracts</li> <li>-SES Agreements</li> <li>-Progress reports</li> <li>-Progress reporting timeframe</li> </ul>	X		<p>-At least one district stated progress reports were not submitted in accordance to the timeframe agreed upon in SES Contract;</p> <p>-Progress reporting timeframe for parents is unclear. The progress reporting timeframe submitted states parents receive weekly or bi-weekly reports, however, weekly progress reports were only submitted for 2 of the 7 students. In addition, some Student Learning Plans/SES Agreements state parents will receive 4 progress reports during the school year while the parent description from the recruitment notice states parents will receive weekly progress reports;</p> <p>-The content of some progress reports is not accurate or adequate. For instance, the majority of the progress reports list goals that are not included in the initial Student Learning Plan/SES Agreement that each student's program is supposed to be structured around. In addition, the goals in the progress reports are not clear objectives. For instance, one report states the academic goal is to help a student "get a better understanding of the areas that he/she needs improvement in". Also, most reports do not include pre-assessment results. Some progress reports do not include updates regarding the students' progress or <i>specific</i> information regarding how students are improving in their academic achievement. All of these details are required for progress reports as per the checklist sent to providers in December 2007. Lastly, some progress reports include updates on standards upon which students are working that are not standards identified as areas for improvement in the initial Student Learning Plan/SES Agreement. For instance, one student's progress report includes an update on math standards the student is working on while the</p>

					student's learning plan states the student will focus only on Language Arts standards.
COMPONENT	DOCUMENTATION NEEDED	DOCUMENTATION SUBMITTED (IDOE use only)	UNSATISFACTORY	SATISFACTORY	COMMENTS
Assessment and Individual Program Design	<p><b>ALL</b> of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Explanation of the process provider uses to develop Individual learning plans for each student</li> <li>- Pre-assessment scores and Individual learning plan for at least one student in each subject provider tutors (any identifying information for the student(s) must be blanked out)</li> <li>-Explanation and evidence regarding how provider's pre and post-test assessment correlates to Indiana academic standards.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Explanation of Individual learning plan development</li> <li>-Some pre-assessment scores</li> <li>-Explanation of one assessment's connection to Indiana academic standards</li> </ul>	<b>X</b>		<p>-Description of the development of individual learning plans is appropriate. However, provider could not produce evidence that any plans (referred to as "Instructional Achievement Plans" in provider's application) had been developed for students. In addition, while the description states that information from assessments is used to develop "daily lesson plans", the observed tutor had no lesson plans. In addition, although the assessment results for the students observed indicated most had received their lowest scores on several other math concepts (i.e. whole numbers, decimals, fractions, measurement, etc.), the math packets for all of the students focused only on ratios, proportions and percents (although several students had much lower scores in other areas). Also, while the description states the provider uses assessment results and other academic information from districts "to develop a strategic educational program based on student need", none of the students had individualized math packets that focused on their specific skill gaps (all students had the same math packet which did not always address the areas in which they had the highest level of skill gaps);</p>

## On-site Monitoring Rubric OBSERVATION Components

**NAME OF PROVIDER:** Standards for Excellence  
**SITE:** Margaret McFarland Middle School  
**TUTOR'S INITIALS (ALL TUTORS OBSERVED):** T.J.  
**NUMBER OF LESSONS OBSERVED:** 1

**DATE:** February 20, 2008  
**REVIEWER:** S.T. & K.C.  
**TIME OF OBSERVATION:** 3:40 p.m.

During the site visit, IDOE personnel will visit several tutoring sessions to observe lessons being provided. IDOE reviewers will be looking to see that actual tutoring matches lesson plan descriptions that are provided in requested documents, as well as those that were provided in the original provider application; that tutors and students are spending an appropriate amount of time on task; that instruction is clear and understandable; and that instructors seem knowledgeable about lesson content.

Each provider will receive a score of 1-4 points for each component. Providers receiving “1 or 2 points” on any component may be required to address deficiencies within 7 calendar days of receiving their final report. Failure to address deficiencies may result in removal from the state approved list.

COMPONENT	1 Below Standard	2 Approaching Standard	3 Meeting Standard	4 Exceeding Standard	REVIEWER COMMENTS
Lesson matches original description in provider application		X			<p>-Students worked on algebra problems from their textbooks with their tutor. The tutor explained that the students' math teacher shared they experienced difficulty grasping this concept during class that day so they worked on algebra from a textbook that day. The tutor also shared that they usually do multiplication drills and work on pages from a math worksheet packet on ratios and proportions;</p> <p>-The observed lesson was not in line with provider's application or the provider's corrective action plan regarding instruction. While it was clear the tutor had disregarded the typical lesson for the session based on a discussion with the students' teacher (which is appropriate to do occasionally), the tutor did not incorporate any of the interactive activities or materials described in the application that were related to the same math concept into the lesson. In addition, the math worksheet packets were the only materials the tutor presented as typical lesson activities. However, the provider's application and corrective action plan states tutors will use “hands on, minds on” activities and an “overhead manipulative kit...during tutoring sessions everyday” in order to “prevent tutors from working with worksheets only”. Lastly, no lesson plans were available and although the tutor had each student's assessment scores, the tutor was not aware of their Individual Learning Plans unlike the description provided in the application.</p>

COMPONENT	1 Below Standard	2 Approaching Standard	3 Meeting Standard	4 Exceeding Standard	REVIEWER COMMENTS
Instruction is clear		X			<p>-Instruction was not always clear and the tutor did not always communicate lesson objectives. For instance, although it was clear the tutor selected algebra based on a discussion that day with the students' math teacher, there was no structure to the lesson as the tutor appeared to randomly select problems and did not provide students with a framework from which to work. In addition, the tutor asked all 4 students to pair up and do a math problem on the board. The tutor wrote the problems on the board and directed the students to begin without providing the students with a review of the math concepts they would need to utilize to solve the problem. This led to one pair of students socializing with each other (while the tutor worked with the other pair on getting the problem started) because they did not know where to begin;</p> <p>-When students provided an incorrect answer, the tutor immediately corrected the student rather than using adjusted instruction or scaffolded instruction to assist students with learning and applying the concepts on their own;</p> <p>-Although the application states that tutors will use differentiation and information from each student's Instructional Achievement Plan (IAP) to provide lessons, differentiation in instruction was not observed and the tutor indicated he/she was not familiar with each student's IAP.</p>
Time on task is appropriate		X			<p>-When reviewers entered the tutoring room, the tutor was working on a slope and intercept math problem on the board with a student in front of the classroom. The other students were in the back of the room socializing. However, once reviewers began to observe the session after 5-7 minutes or so, the tutor asked the students in the back of the room to come to the front of the room to work on the chalkboard on a math problem. Although the off task students were redirected, it was not immediate and it was unknown how long prior to the observation these students had remained off task;</p> <p>-Students sometimes socialized when they were waiting for the tutor to assist them with progressing on a math problem but students worked diligently when the tutor was interacting with them.</p>
Instructor is appropriately knowledgeable		X			<p>-Tutor was knowledgeable about the algebra concepts upon which the students worked, however, the tutor was not always able to translate this knowledge into instruction to the students;</p> <p>-Tutor did not vary instructional strategies used with students although it was evident that the students' ability levels were very different from one another;</p> <p>-Tutor did not appear to know how to adjust and adapt his/her tutoring strategies when it was clear the strategy of having the students work on problems on the board was creating more chaos (students not receiving assistance from tutor goofed-off or socialized) than anticipated. In addition, when it became clear both pairs of students needed a review or introduction to the algebra concepts upon which they were working, the tutor continued to give students problems they were unable to solve without a more basic understanding of the concepts.</p>
Student/instructor ratio: 4:1			X		<p>Observed ratio of 4:1 is in line with ratio reported in original provider application (5:1). Small group instruction was observed.</p>

## On-site Monitoring Visit Rubric COMPLIANCE Components

**NAME OF PROVIDER:** Standards for Excellence

**DATE DOCUMENTATION RECEIVED:** March 5, 2008

**REVIEWER:** S.T.

The following information is rated “Compliance” (C) or “Non-Compliance” (N-C). Selected documentation listed for each component must be submitted as part of the site visit monitoring. If documentation is not available on-site, the director or head of the provider’s organization, the site director, or another authorized representative will be required to submit documentation to the IDOE within seven (7) calendar days of site visit completion. **Failure to submit evidence could result in removal from the approved provider list.**

If a provider is deemed to be in non-compliance with any component for which evidence has been requested, the provider may be contacted and may be required to develop and submit a corrective action plan for getting into compliance within 7 calendar days. If the corrective action plan is not submitted, if the corrective action plan is inappropriate or insufficient, or if the corrective action plan is not implemented, the provider may be removed from the state-approved list.

COMPONENT	REQUIRED DOCUMENTATION	DOCUMENTATION SUBMITTED (IDOE USE ONLY)	C	N-C
Criminal background checks	<b>ALL</b> of the following:  -Criminal background checks from an appropriate source for every tutor and any other employees working directly with children.	-Background Checks -Three background checks were not completed prior to the tutors working with students. -Two background checks had employee names that were incorrectly spelled.		<b>X</b>
Health and safety laws and regulations	<b>ONE</b> of the following: -Student release policy(ies)  <i>In addition to:</i> <b>ONE</b> of the following: -Safety plans and/or records -Department of Health documentation of physical plant safety (if operating at a site other than a school) -Evacuation plans/policies (e.g., in case of fire, tornado, etc.) -Transportation policies (as applicable)	-Student release policy -Evacuation plan	<b>X</b>	
Financial viability	<b>ONE</b> of the following: -Documentation of liability insurance coverage  <i>In addition to:</i> <b>ONE</b> of the following: -Audited financial statements -Tax return for the past two years	-Verification of Liability Insurance -Tax returns for past two years	<b>X</b>	